

Governor's Water Augmentation Council

Long-Term Water Augmentation Committee

December 5, 2018 Meeting Summary

Time: 10:00am – 12:00 pm

Location: Arizona Department of Water Resources

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chairwoman Maureen George called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

II. Introductions

The following members of the Governor's Water Augmentation Council (GWAC) were present: Maureen George, Wade Noble, Bruce Hallin, Sarah Porter, Scott Deeny, Bill Plummer. In attendance from the consultant's project team were Richard Humphreys, Rupal Pandya, Christopher Rife, Guy Carpenter.

III. Presentation of Water Augmentation Project Concepts for Each Planning Area

Richard Humphreys, Carollo Engineers, began his presentation with a Tribal water rights settlement status map and map that identified the planning areas affected by Arizona's surface water rights adjudications. There was discussion regarding the planning uncertainty in areas where there are unsettled Tribal water rights claims or on-going adjudication. It was noted that entities would likely not initiate large water augmentation projects until that uncertainty was resolved. The Committee agreed it is important to acknowledge this in the final report. Sarah Porter and Scott Deeny offered to craft language relaying such a principle, for possible committee approval, and inclusion in the final report. Mr. Humphreys also explained the reasoning behind the grouping of the projects into the specific time periods and planning areas.

Mr. Humphreys presented a new approach for consideration by the Committee for the next steps of the analysis process. His team recommends an approach that moves away from comparing the alternatives available to a planning area and moves towards creation of fact sheets for the proposed water augmentation options with information regarding project specific parameters. The fact sheets would not be site specific but would contain a comprehensive definition of the options and many of the original evaluation factors such as water yield, levelized cost per AF, required permits, etc. (see the presentation [here](#)). The non-site specific fact sheets, could work in conjunction with the maps displaying icons of the potential feasible options in each planning area where applicable. The fact sheets would provide the regions with a "tool box" of augmentation options to explore for regional solutions. The Committee agreed to pursue the approach recommended by the consultant.

The Committee agreed that the definition of augmented water means "new water in the water portfolio" and therefore some of the augmentation options previously identified by the Committee, such as conservation measures, are not augmentation options and should be removed from the list of possible options. Instead, the Committee agreed those options can be given a well-rounded definition and described as being available to all planning areas, in general. The Committee also gave direction as to the deletion, incorporation, or need for further definition refinements and statewide application, of some options.

An option was added to the evaluation based on the recommendation of the Committee that the consultant review the Strategic Vision to determine if the list was complete. The option that was added by the consultant was development of a water management plan. It was discussed and generally recognized that every planning area statewide should devise their own water management plan to allow them to develop an understanding regarding their local water situation prior to consideration of augmentation

options. The final report could indicate which planning areas do not have a management plan.

Other topics discussed related to the augmentation options or projects:

- It was noted that aquifer development could be something other than deep wells, such as utilizing storage at existing reservoirs or increasing storage at existing reservoirs. The example given was storage at Roosevelt.
- Both surface water law and groundwater law may require regulatory revisions for certain augmentation options. A general statement could be included in the report regarding the potential use and advantages of a recharge facility to manage the peak demands on the canals.
- Brackish groundwater desalination needs a very refined definition which includes discussion about price point and regional interest. Brackish groundwater desalination should be identified as feasible in any planning area that was identified as having feasible brackish groundwater supplies in the Montgomery study.
- It is important to package the final report conveying the intent that even though some of the proposed augmentation options could be controversial and/or complex, they are to be utilized as a tool box of options to consider for areas seeking water augmentation.
- The Diversion projects shown in the 0-60-year time frame need a clearer definition showing its tie to other projects, such as ocean desalination, and expressed as an exchanger or transfer, rather than a facility. Also referring to the map in that timeframe, it was suggested to number each of the ocean desal projects with an explanation showing the transportation and exchanges involved, who it could benefit and what it would take to implement.

IV. Discussion and Committee Guidance on Water Augmentation Projects to Analyze Further in the Evaluation Process

The Committee agreed that the next steps in the analysis process for the consultant will be:

1. to create the fact sheets which will further refine and sort the projects and show the planning areas to which they apply, rather than the original idea of ranking the projects. This will complete Task 3.
2. further definition and narration regarding the very long-term (0-60 years) augmentation options of out of state importation, which would consider basins outside Arizona, ocean desalination and transportation and transfer/exchange as involved in each. The Committee would like to see a narrative exploring the long-term process that would be required in order to begin these types of projects, for forward thinking and discussions statewide. As related to the Scope of Work, this last step will comprise Task 4, and be regarded as the "2-3 specific selected projects for the deeper evaluation". At least one of the final projects considered in the "deep dive" analysis should involve multiple planning areas or a statewide effort to show the benefit of working together for water augmentation.

V. Closing remarks and Next meeting Date

Chairwoman George announced this was her last meeting with the Committee as she is retiring. Mr. Wade Noble was announced as the incoming Committee Chair.

The next meeting will be dependent on the consultant's revised schedule based on the new Committee direction. The meeting will occur about two weeks after the Task 3 and 4 materials are posted for Committee review, perhaps early March. The consultant will post the fact sheets, including the expanded ("deeper dive") fact sheets of the importation/exchange/transportation and ocean desalination options selected by the Committee at this meeting. He will also post a sample outline of the final report. The purpose of the March meeting will be to approve the material and discuss the final report.